DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 828 RC 005 491

AUTHOR	Kuvlesky, William P.; Cannon, Margaret
TITLE	Perceptions of Racial Prejudice Among Rural and Small Town Blacks in a Southern County.
INSTITUTION	Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 71
NOTE	58p.; Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, Colorado, August 1971
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis, Integration Effects, *Negro Attitudes, *Negro Mothers, Negro Stereotypes, Neighborhood Integration, *Racial Discrimination, *Racial Integration, Research Needs, *Rural Areas, Rural Urban Differences, School Integration, Social Integration, Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS	Texas

ABSTRACT

Based on a June 1970 survey of 259 black homemakers (women between 18 and 65 having children in the household) in 2 villages and 1 town of an East Texas county (75% rural, disproportionately high rate of low-income families relative to Texas as a whole, 25% black, and pervaded by traditional southern culture), this paper presents 4 general conclusions: blacks perceive a high degree of racial prejudice among their white counterparts; blacks tend to be relatively positive about the possibility for racial integration in general but tend to be divided on the desirability of it; substantial differences in orientation toward race relations exist among blacks relative to size of place of residence; and many blacks still do not desire school integration, even though they perceive it to be possible and, in fact, it has taken place. In the document, a narrative and tabular description of respondents (age, education, size of family, income) and a statement of the observations, indicators, and data operations lead into the analysis and findings concerning the 4 primary data comparisons (perception of prejudice, desire for integration, perception of possibility for integration, and relation between possibility and desire for integration) by town and village residence. A 17-point summary of major findings, a 4-pronged discussion of the study's relevance, 22 references, and 4 appendices (instruments, distribution of responses, description of the study county, and cross-classification of specified responses) close out the paper. (BO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
AUG 30 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED053828

PERCEPTIONS OF RACIAL PREJUDICE AMONG RURAL AND SMALL TOWN BLACKS IN A SOUTHERN COUNTY*[1]

William P. Kuvlesky and Margaret Cannon
Texas A&M University

*Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, August, 1971. This paper contributes to TAES project H-2906 and USDA (CSRS) regional project NC-90, "Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families".

[1]Technical article number____of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.

William P. Kuvlesky is an associate professor and Margaret Cannon is a graduate research assistant in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas.

RC005491

THE PROBLEM

As A. Lee Coleman (1965) suggested in his Presidential Address to the Rural Sociological Society several years ago, rural sociologists have been delinquent in researching the Negro minority and their relations to others in rural areas. Little has been done in the meantime to invalidate this observation by Coleman. A case in point is the almost total lack of reported studies pertaining to the degree of prejudice exhibited toward rural blacks, the amount of social discrimination they experience, and the effect these patterns have on the blacks.

The purpose of this paper is to help meliorate this lack of knowledge by providing findings from a recent study of the perceived nature of race relations among 259 adult, black women residing in a nonmetropolitan county of the South. More precisely, the analysis to be described here was structured to determine whether or not size of place of residence (town of 5,000 vs. open-country villages) is associated with differences in the following dimensions of race relations as perceived by the black respondents: (1) perception of racial prejudice directed toward the blacks by local whites; (2) desire for racial integration; and (3) perception of possibility for racial integration in their local areas.

This paper is viewed as exploratory in nature. Consequently, the emphasis is on empirical description of rural Negroes' perceptions of race relations, and not on explaining these or relating them to other variables, posited as causal results in some theoretically derived causal chain.[1/] For the purpose of this paper, no prior theoretical framework is intended

or pretended. The potential theoretical significance of the findings are presented as ex post facto interpretations.

RELEVANT LITERATURE

For our purposes, it will suffice to explore the literature that specifically relates to variations in size of place of residence, "rural-urban" differences, and the rural South relative to Negroes' perceptions of race relations. In this regard, Lee Coleman has already produced a comprehensive review of the relevant literature in his article entitled, "The Rural-Urban Variable in Race Relations" (1965). This piece provides a good historical account of what little has evolved over the years on the subject. Unfortunately, the essence of Coleman's overview is that almost nothing in the way of hard empirical data exists on the blacks' perceptions and reactions to the equality of racially-structured social situations in the South.

Bettelheim and Janowitz (1964:21) assert that "there is a gradual decrease in the level of ethnic intolerance as one goes from rural areas and small towns to cities under a million to cities over a million." However, they cite no evidence to back up this statement. Robin Williams has concluded from an examination of several research studies that size of community does influence racial prejudice: the large community has less extensive or intense racial prejudice than the small one (1964:Chpt. 6). However, it seems apparent from his statements that this generalization pertains specifically to differences between a "large city" and "smaller towns" (Williams, 1964:116-117). Can one extend this generalization to

differences among relatively smaller places (i.e., a small town as compared with villages)? We could locate no prior research findings relevant to this question. Coleman (1965) reviews several attitudinal studies in the general area of rural-urban differences relative to race relations and finds them inconclusive. In a recent bibliography of research reports on the Negro, Miller (1966) has provided a section on "Rural Problems", but lists nothing that would apparently provide information on the relationship of place of residence to prejudice.

Some of the results Williams (1964) reports from the Cornell studies of prejudice and race relations have interpretive significance for this effort:

> (1) that blacks do perceive prejudice directed to them and retaliate in kind (p. 247).
>
> (2) that females indicate more racial prejudice than males and that Negro females demonstrate the most racial prejudice (p. 269).
>
> (3) that Southern Negroes demonstrate more prejudice than other Negroes (p. 274).

Turning our attention to the specific variables we are concerned with in this analysis -- blacks' perceptions of race relations -- little empirical research has been reported and none exists, as far as we know, on Southern rural blacks. A general tendency in the literature seems to be to view the problem as one centered in whites' attitudes, and consequently, to focus on prejudice demonstrated by whites.[2/]

Almost all of the empirical research reported on black perceptions of race relations that we located are somewhat dated -- done 10-20 years ago or earlier. Several broad generalizations appear to be supported by these

findings. First, socioeconomic status of blacks makes a difference in the prejudice directed toward whites: middle class blacks demonstrate less prejudice toward whites than their upper or lower class counterparts (Cothran, 1951:458-467; Noel and Pinkney, 1964:609-622). Others have also observed that SES status is importantly related to blacks' attitudes toward whites (Glenn and Bonjean, 1969:8; Westie and Howard, 1954:584-591; Williams, 1964:177-179).[3/] Research also exists to indicate that generally blacks prefer to associate with members of their own race than with whites -- when forced to make a choice (Mann, 1958:150; Cox and Krumboltz, 1958:299). Intimate contacts with whites who are status equals reduces prejudice (Works, 1961:47-48; Williams, 1964:Chpt. 7). Research has also indicated that Negro attitudes toward whites vary by class status of white and nature of the relationship (Westie and Howard, 1954:584-591; Williams, 1964).[4/]

In conclusion, the research findings available do not contribute much to enlightening us on rural blacks' orientations toward race relations or on place of residence differences that might be expected in this regard. The findings of past research, however, do caution against an easy attitude toward generalizations drawn from a rather homogeneous population, such as we are investigating here.[5/]

SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

The information for this analysis came from part of a larger study structured to investigate comprehensively the nature of black families in selected communities of nonmetropolitan East Texas.[6/] We purposely

selected one East Texas county that was judged to be fairly representative of the predominantly agricultural, nonmetropolitan eastern section of the state that is pervaded by the traditional southern culture. This county was predominantly rural (75%), had a disproportionately high rate of low-income families relative to Texas as a whole, and was about one-fourth Negro. (See APPENDIX C for a more detailed description.)

Within this county, we selected the largest population center -- a town of about 5,000, which was about one-quarter black -- and two all-black, open-country villages to serve as the universe for drawing our respondents according to certain screening criteria required for the regional investigation.[7/]

Our respondents were designated to be homemakers having children in the household, not over 65 years of age, and not under 18 (unless they were the mother of at least one child). These selection criteria obviously produced a study population unrepresentative of the total black population in these centers: the prime population segments excluded were males, children, and old women. In all three communities, about 50% of the black households were screened as relevant for this study, and we interviewed almost all of the homemakers in these selected units during June of 1970, Table 1.

DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

Living Conditions of Respondents

In the communities selected as study units, black families are segregated as a residence group regardless of class -- the two villages were all black

Table 1. Summary Information On Numbers of Black Households Available, Eligible for Study, And Interviewed In Communities Selected For Study.

	Town	Village #1	Village #2	Total
Total Number of Black Households	449	73	34	556
Rate of Units Eligible	48%	49%	50%	48%
Rate of Eligible Units Interviewed	94%	97%	100%	95%
Number of Interviews	207	35	17	259

and relatively isolated geographically. Schools in these communities had only undergone racial integration in the past two years.[8]

The immediate living circumstances of the black families observed demonstrated a wide range of conditions of living; however, most were clearly living in what would have to be labeled poor or disadvantaged circumstances. The following observations gleaned from the interviews give some picture of this:

(1) Although two-thirds of the black families involved owned their own homes, about half of the respondents indicated they were not satisfied with their housing.

(2) About half of the households had no more than 4 rooms and 75% had 5 or less.

(3) Over half did not have a phone in the home.

(4) A little less than half did not have a flush toilet and a little less than half had neither a tub nor a shower.

(5) One out of four did not have running water in the house and almost half did not have hot running water.

(6) While less than half read a newspaper daily, 90% did have a black and white TV.

Several other findings gleaned from direct observations are also worth noting.[9] The vast majority of homes involved were located on unpaved streets and were of frame construction. In the lower income cases, the homes were often very poorly built, unpainted, wooden structures.

Some Background Characteristics of the Respondents[10]

Almost all (87%) of the respondents were born in the local area or in surrounding places within fifty miles. The main breadwinners of the families involved were almost always low-skilled workers -- less than one

out of ten held high prestige white-collar jobs or a skilled trade. Roughly nine out of ten respondents came from families where neither the mother or father had completed high school: in the majority of cases, they had not even started high school. About 70% of the families were intact and were characterized by equalitarian power structures (Kutner, 1970).

While the total study population of families was relatively homogeneous on the characteristics described above, a good deal of variation existed in reference to several of the social attributes of the respondents and their families that had potential interpretive significance for this analysis. Consequently, we compared the town and village residents on these to see if significant differences existed:

(1) Age of Respondent (Table 2) - village respondents were significantly older (3+ years) on the average than their town counterparts. The greatest difference between the two groups was that many more town respondents were very young -- (25 or less). The majority of respondents in both cases were 26-45 years of age.

(2) Education of Respondent (Table 3) - the two resident types demonstrated similar profiles of education. Few had completed high school and large proportions of both (almost half of the village residents) had completed less than nine grades.

(3) Size of Family (Table 4) - size of family profiles were similar for both groupings. The majority of respondents had a family of 5-8 people, and the average was between 5 and 6 for both groups.

(4) Family Income (Table 5) - again, the two resident groups were very similar. A large minority indicated family incomes of less than $3,000 per year and a marked majority indicated the family had

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Age of Respondents by Residence Type.

Age	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=205)
	----------Percent----------	
25 or less	6	19
26 - 35	27	30
36 - 45	32	26
45 or more	35	25
TOTAL	100	100
Mean age*	40.37	36.64
*t = 2.15	df = 255	.02 < P < .05

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Education of Respondents by Residence Type.

Grades Completed	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=206)
	----------Percent----------	
8 or less	48	37
9 - 11	44	58
12 or more	8	5
TOTAL	100	100
x^2 = 2.72	df = 2	.20 < P < .30

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Family Size by Residence Type.

Number in Family	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=207)
	---------Percent----------	
4 or less	32	41
5 - 8	60	50
9 or more	8	9
TOTAL	100	100
Mean size*	5.85	5.28
*t = 1.71	df = 257	.05 < P < .10

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Family Income by Residence Type.

Family Income	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=207)
	----------Percent----------	
Less than $3,000	35	22
$3,000 - $5,999	38	44
$6,000 - $9,999	21	29
$10,000 or more	6	5
TOTAL	100	100
$x^2 = 4.24$	df = 3	.20 < P < .30

less than $6,000 per year.

(5) Employment of Homemaker (Table 6) - the two resident groups were also similar in this respect. Almost 40% were employed full-time, at least part of the year, and an equal proportion were not employed at all.

In summary, in reference to characteristics we chose to examine, the town and village dwellers do not seem to differ significantly in reference to the usual condition of life and SES indicators. While the age differences observed were statistically significant, even the difference here was rather small -- 3 years.

OBSERVATIONS, INDICATORS, AND DATA OPERATIONS

Interviewing of Respondents

During the Spring of 1970, all of the black households in the communities studied were located on maps, and the researchers spent several weeks developing relations with local facilitators and making observations of the study community.[11/] Potential interviewers were recruited from black women teaching school in an adjacent county, and a week was spent in training and field testing these interviewers: several were released at the close of the training period. The interviews took about 1 1/2 hours on the average and, with very few exceptions, the interviewers reported that good cooperation was easily established with the respondents.

One of the researchers was constantly available to provide assistance to the interviewers, and the questionnaires were carefully checked and evaluated every night.

Table 6.. Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Employment Status by Residence Type.

Employment Status	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=207)
	----------Percent----------	
Full Time All Year	27	29
Full Time Part of Year	11	10
Part Time	12	24
Not Employed	50	37
TOTAL	100	100
$x^2 = 5.15$	df = 3	$.10 < P < .20$

Instruments and Measurements

Three dependent variables are involved in this analysis: (1) perception of racial prejudice directed toward blacks by local whites; (2) desire for racial integration, and (3) perception of the possibility for racial integration in the local area. Instruments used to tap each of these variables consisted of multi-item inventories (scales) and were attached to the main set of instruments. The questionnaire statements pertaining to each are presented in APPENDIX A, and the distributions of original responses to each item for each of the three inventories are provided in APPENDIX D. The nature of the instruments and the scale scores they produced are described briefly below.

Perception of Prejudice

According to Mann (1958:16), prejudice can be defined as "a tendency to believe that (a) some racial groups are superior to and therefore more socially desirable than others, and (b) members of one's own group are particularly desirable." Of course, prejudice can be either positive or negative and, according to Williams (1964:28), can be one of three types: cognitive, affective, and evaluative. The instrument we have constructed to measure blacks' perception of prejudice directed toward them by whites involves only negative, cognitive (stereotyped) prejudice. Williams also cautions that these negative prejudgments vary in inclusiveness relative to the target population (they may or may not include all segments of a particular population). The items used in our instrument specifically direct the black respondents' judgments to people in their local areas -- "white people around here."

Five forced-choice items were used indicating stereotypes of blacks often held by whites.[12/] The respondents were asked to respond to the extent with which they agreed that whites in their local areas held each of these by indicating a preference for one of four scaled options: (1) "strongly disagree", (2) "tend to disagree", (3) "tend to agree" and, (4) "strongly agree". By adding the scale values of individual items (according to the numbers shown above for the response alternatives), an unweighted, total scale score was achieved for "perceived prejudice". Potential variation in scores ranged from 5-20 and the actual scores of respondents realized this potential range, Table 7.

Desire for Racial Integration

Desire for integration was indicated by six forced-choice items calling for an indication of the respondent's preference for interacting with "Negroes Only" or "Negroes and Whites" in the following social contexts: church, children in school, children at play outside of school, living in the neighborhood, "close personal friendships", and ownership of stores patronized. These options cover a range of degree of informality -- formality in social relations, which had been found to influence racial attributes among both blacks and whites (Williams, 1964:253 and 297-298). An unweighted total score was derived to indicate "desire for integration" by adding scores of the six individual items ("Negroes Only" = 1; "Negroes and Whites" = 2). The potential range in variation of total scores was 6-12, and the respondents' actual scores realized this potential range, Table 8.

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of "Perceived Prejudice" Total Scores by Residence Type.

Score	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=206)
	percent	
5 (-)	2	0
6	2	0
8	4	0
9	2	2
10	6	1
11	0	2
12	10	3
13	4	3
14	2	6
15	14	14
16	10	8
17	19	13
18	2	13
19	4	10
20 (+)	19	25
Total	100	100
Mean*	15.24	16.99

*$t = -3.75$ df = 256 $P < .01$

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of "Desire for Integration" Total Scores by Residence Type.

Score	Villages (N = 52)	Town (N=206)
	----------percent----------	
6 (-)	31	11
7	10	14
8	8	8
9	10	9
10	9	13
11	9	14
12 (+)	23	31
Total	100	100
Mean*	8.79	9.65

*$t = -2.51$ df = 256 $.01 < P < .02$

Perception of Possibility for Integration

The perception of possibility for integration was indicated by an instrument purposely designed to include items representing the same contextual situations as those described above for desire of integration. One difference between the two sets is that store ownership was not included here.[13/] The respondent was asked to indicate whether it was possible or not for Negroes and whites to interact in the five social situations specified. Possible was scored "1" and not possible "2", and the scores were summed to produce a total scale score indicating degree of possibility for integration perceived. The potential range in scores is 5-10 (the lower the score the higher the possibility) and the actual scores of respondents realized this range, Table 9.

Data Operations[14/]

Responses to the individual items of each scale and total scale scores were transferred to data cards, and all subsequent data operations were done on a computer. Several statistical testing procedures were utilized and are described at relevant points in the presentation of the analysis and findings.

ANALYSIS - FINDINGS

The design for analysis, in keeping with our descriptive intent, involves four primary comparisons of data by town and village residence. The first three sections are concerned with detailed examination of the sets of data related to blacks' perceptions of race relations -- perception of prejudice (PP), desire for integration (DI), and perception of possibility for integration (PPI). In each of these cases, we examine

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of "Perceived Possibility for Integration" Total Scores by Residence Type.

Score	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=206)
	percent	
5 (+)	54	32
6	19	21
7	15	17
8	6	15
9	6	14
10 (-)	0	1
Total	100	100
Mean*	5.90	6.62

*$t = -3.23$ df = 256 $P < .01$

both the total scale scores and responses to the individual inventory items by type of residence. The fourth segment consists of an extension of our original plans for analysis aimed at an investigation of the relation between possibility and desire for integration by residence type.

Perception of Racial Prejudice (PP)

As was noted earlier, we are measuring only blacks' perceptions of the cognitive type of prejudice here, indicated by negative stereotypes of Negroes held by whites. The most striking observation made from our observation of the distribution of total PP scores is that the vast majority of both town and village black homemakers indicated perceptions of high levels of prejudice (see Table 7). In both cases, the distribution of total PP scores is skewed markedly toward the high end -- a majority of both residence types had scores that fell in the highest third (above 15) of the potential range.

More of the town respondents indicated perception of a high degree of prejudice (15 to 20), which is reflected in the statistically significant difference in mean PP scores. In a similar fashion, a substantial proportion (16%) of village respondents perceived little or no prejudice (PP scores of 5-10) as compared with very few (3%) town respondents. In general, although both residence groups perceived relatively high levels of racial prejudice, town respondents perceived significantly more prejudice directed at them by whites.

An examination of responses to the five individual items reflecting black stereotypes held by whites, which constituted the PP scale, can indicate whether or not town and village people differed in the particular

stereotypes they perceived. Findings summarized in Table 10 indicate that a marked majority of both types agreed that all five stereotypes were held by whites. In all cases, a higher proportion of town respondents, than village, indicated that whites held these stereotypes. What little difference existed among the town and village respondents in frequency of perceiving these stereotypes was accounted for mostly by converse patterns for tendency toward extreme responses, Table 11.

The town respondents much more frequently indicated "strongly agree", and the village people much more frequently indicated the opposite extreme in reference to these stereotypes existing among local whites. This may mean that due to the higher probability for racial interaction among town people, they are more likely to experience more instances of "negative" race relations than the village people. On the other hand, it may indicate that village whites are not quite as prejudiced.

Desire for Integration (DI)

Both residence groupings appear to break down into two camps in regard to desire for racial integration -- those in favor and those not -- as indicated by the bipolar distributions of their total DI scale scores (see Table 8). Yet, a significant residence difference exists in this regard: almost three times as many (proportionately) of the village dwellers (31% vs. 11%) desired continuation of racial segregation in all six social contexts represented by items used in the DI scale (indicated by a score of 6). A converse, but less marked, pattern can be noted at the opposite extreme. In general, then, the town respondents desired

Table 10. Summary of Affirmative Responses (Strongly Agree and Agree) to Perceived Prejudice Items by Place of Residence.*

Item	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=255)	P at .05 (X^2)
	----------Percent Affirmative----------			
1. Judge Negroes by Worst	72	86	84	No (.10)
2. Don't Like to Be Around Negroes	70	83	81	Yes
3. Don't Like White Kids to Play With Negro Kids	66	84	81	Yes
4. Never Let You Forget You Are a Negro	80	92	89	Yes
5. Think They Are Cleaner Than Negroes	82	93	90	No (.10)

Table 11. Percentage of Residence Types Giving Extreme Responses to Perceived Prejudice Items: Strongly Agree vs. Strongly Disagree.*

Item	"Strongly Agree"		"Strongly Disagree"	
	Villages	Town	Villages	Town
	----------Percent----------			
1. Judge Negroes by Worst	41	48	8	3
2. Don't Like to Be Around Negroes	29	42	8	1
3. Don't Like White Kids to Play With Negro Kids	31	45	6	1
4. Never Let You Forget You Are a Negro	47	63	6	0
5. Think They Are Cleaner Than Negroes	51	66	6	0
Mean %	39.8	52.8	6.8	1.0

*See APPENDIX B - Part I for distribution of actual responses and for more detail on x^2 tests.

integration more, or at least more comprehensively, than did the village dwellers.

The rather extensive variation of both populations among the distribution of possible DI scores indicates clearly a lack of high consensus among these rural black women on the desirability for integration, and a possible wide variation in specification relative to which kinds of social situations should experience racial integration. Indeed, the village-town differences noted above might be explained in part by variation in situational specification of desirability for racial integration.

In every one of the six situational contexts specified in our DI scale items, the village dwellers more often indicated a preference for interacting with "Negroes Only" than did their town counterparts: however, only three of these cases were judged to be statistically significant -- stores, church, and school, Table 12. The town respondents tended to be in favor of integration, regardless of social context, while the village people demonstrated a converse pattern: only in one case (neighborhood) do more than half of the town respondents desire to maintain segregation as compared to four such cases for the village group (church, friendship, neighborhood, and stores). It also can be inferred from these data that the village and town respondents tend to be split into opposing camps on the issue of desirability for racial integration relative to some relational contexts and not others. What is more, the relatively divisive factors tend to vary: town -- church, neighborhood, friendship; villages -- stores, school, children at play, neighborhood. Neighborhood seems to be the only relational context that divides both groups about equally.

Table 12. Preference For Racial Integration as Opposed to Segregation in Six Different Social Contexts by Residence Type.*

Social Context	Prefer Racial Integration			P at .05 (X^2)
	Villages	Town	Total	
	Percent			
Stores (Buy From)	48	78	72	Yes
Church	37	52	49	Yes
School	56	70	67	Yes
Children (Play)	54	64	62	No (.20)
Neighborhood	44	49	48	No (.70)
Friendship (Close)	40	53	51	No (.10)

*See APPENDIX B - Part II for more detail.

Table 13. Perceived Possibility For Integration in Different Social Contexts by Residence Type.*

Social Context	Possible			P at .05 (X^2)
	Villages	Town	Total	
	Percent			
Church	65	55	57	No (.20)
School	100	96	97	--
Children (Play)	88	74	77	Yes
Neighborhood	88	58	64	Yes
Friendship (Close)	67	57	59	No (.20)

*See APPENDIX B - Part III for more detail.

It is of interest to note that the statistically significant differences between the residence types occur in reference to the three items indicating informal type social relations (see Table 12). It can be inferred from this that the two groups are more likely to disagree on desirability for integration in the more impersonal social relations among people of different races -- the town respondents being more positively oriented in this regard.

Perception of Possibility for Integration (PPI)

The PPI scale was constructed to reveal the realistic appraisal of the prospects for racial integration in the local area by the black respondents over a range of social relationships, paralleling those described above relative to the DI scale. The total PPI scores are skewed toward the low end of the range -- high possibility -- for both residence types, but more markedly so for the villagers (see Table 9). It is clear from these observations that a marked majority of both groups perceive good prospects (PPI scores 5-7) for racial integration in all or most of the social contexts considered here. Given this similarity, an important residence difference did exist in the frequency with which this positive evaluation of potential for integration occurred: over half of the villagers as compared with only about a third of the town respondents thought integration is possible in all situations considered (score of 5). Also, only 12% of the villagers, as compared with 30% of the townspeople, felt that integration is not possible in more than half the types of social contexts considered (scores of 8-10). We will now turn to the situationally-specific items included in the scale to see if village-town patterns of differences are consistent or not.

In every case -- relative to church, school, children outside of school, neighborhood, and friendship -- the villagers more frequently indicated that integration is possible, Table 13. However, substantial and statistically significant differences in this regard exist only in reference to neighborhood and children outside of school. Almost all the respondents felt that integration of schools is possible; this is not surprising given the fact that the schools in these places were recently forced to integrate. Both populations appear to be divided most equally on their appraisal for possible integration in reference to church and close friendships (and for the town only, neighborhood). In summary, the vast majority of village people tended to be positive about their evaluations of possible integration in reference to every social context (except school), while the townspeople more often evidenced a substantial split in evaluation.

Possibility vs. Desire for Integration: Extended Analysis

The earlier findings that village people consistently perceived a higher possibility of integration than the town respondents, but desired it less, encouraged us to extend our original intentions for analysis to look more closely at this relationship.

At an aggregate level of analysis, some impressions can be obtained of how much the two residence types -- viewed as groups -- differed in perception of possibility for integration and desire for it by examining the differences in group proportions in this regard. We posed the question, "How many more of the respondents of each type perceived integration

to be possible than desired it?" The answer to this question was obtained by subtracting the percent desiring integration from the percent perceiving integration to be possible for each common social context item, Table 14.

The results are striking. In each case, a much larger percentage of village dwellers perceived integration to be possible than desired it; and in reference to all six items, the difference between the village and town groups on "percent difference" were large. The aggregate percentages of possibility and desire were more similar for the town in general (and on the average) than they were for the village. In fact, in two cases (church and neighborhood), more of the townspeople desired integration than perceived it to be possible.

One additional observation of interest gleaned from this operation (Table 14) is that for both residence groups, the greatest gap between possibility and desire for integration occurred in reference to the school. In both cases, all or almost all respondents saw integration to be possible, but many fewer desired it. It would definitely appear from this that dramatic increases in possibility for racial integration (at least, when it is imposed from outside the community) has a negative impact on desire for integration.

Switching focus from the residence groups to the individuals within them as the unit of analysis provides another perspective on the relationship of perceived possibility and desire for racial integration. For each common social context item in the two scale inventories (church, school, children at play, neighborhood, friendships), we cross-classified the responses to preference for interaction ("Negroes Only" vs. "Negro and White") and evaluation of possibility for racial integration ("Possible"

Table 14. A Comparison of Village and Town Respondents on the Difference Between the Percentage of Each Group Perceiving Integration to be Possible and the Percentage Desiring Integration.

Social Context	Villages			Towns		
	% Integration Possible	% Desiring Integration	Difference in %	% Integration Possible	% Desiring Integration	Difference in %
Church	65	48	+17	55	88	-33
School	100	37	+63	96	52	+44
Children (Play)	88	56	+32	74	70	+ 4
Neighborhood	88	54	+34	58	64	- 6
Friendship	67	40	+27	57	49	+ 8

vs. "Not Possible") by residence type. Tabular presentations of the data and results of statistical tests for this operation are provided in APPENDIX D. These results generally indicate that for town respondents, a very strong positive correlation exists between perception of possibility for racial integration and desire for it in reference to each type of social relationship considered (except school) (see APPENDIX D, Tables 1-5). This was not observed in the case of the villages: while those seeing integration as not possible (a minority in every case) predominantly indicated a lack of desire for racial integration, the converse pattern did not show up clearly.

In summary, it can be concluded that a much stronger positive association generally existed between perception of opportunity and desire for integration among town than village blacks.[15] This would appear to mean that these two variables have a greater tendency to operate independently among village blacks.

Summary of Major Findings

The results indicated both similarities and differences in perception of and orientations toward race relations between the town and village black women studied here. Generally, the similarities existed in reference to more inclusive patterns and the differences observed were differences in degree rather than kind. Below we have summarized the major findings of this investigation:

Similarities: Town and Village Blacks

1. Perception of Racial Prejudice:

   (a) Both residence types generally perceived a high degree of racial prejudice on the part of local whites.

   (b) A majority of both types agreed that local whites maintain all five stereotyped images of blacks considered.

2. Desire for Racial Integration:

   (a) A definite tendency was noted for both residence groupings to polarize into extreme camps in their orientations toward the desirability of racial integration, indicating a lack of consensus in this regard.

   (b) Surprisingly large proportions of both groups did not view school integration to be desirable, even though their schools were integrated.[16]

3. Possibility for Racial Integration:

   (a) Respondents of both groups were generally positive in their evaluation of the possibility for comprehensive racial integration.

   (b) A majority of both groupings perceived integration to be possible in all of the five social contexts considered.

   (c) Almost all respondents of both types perceived racial integration in the schools as possible; however, both groups tended to be equally divided in their evaluations relative to church and friendship.

4. Perception of Possibility - Desire for Integration:

   (a) For the residence groups as a whole, substantial incongruence existed between the frequency of perception of opportunity for racial integration and the desire for it in reference to most social relationships (i.e., the former exceeded the latter for both groups).
   (b) In reference to both town and village dwellers negative perception of opportunity was markedly associated with a tendency to desire to interact with "Negroes Only."[17]

Important Differences: Town and Village Blacks

1. Perception of Prejudice:

   (a) Town respondents generally perceived a higher degree of racial prejudice on the part of local whites.

   (b) Village respondents were markedly more likely to perceive little or no racial prejudice on the part of local whites.

2. Desire for Integration:

   (a) Substantially larger proportions of village respondents favored racial segregation and, conversely, the town dwellers more often favored racial integration. This general pattern of difference was observed to occur universally across each of the six relationships considered, but was most substantial in reference to formal social relationships.[18]

   (b) The tendency to split into more or less equal opposing camps on desirability for integration varied by social relationship between town and village residents, except in reference to neighborhood.

3. Possibility for Integration:

   (a) Villagers more often perceived across-the-board racial integration as possible than did town residents.

   (b) A marked majority of villagers perceived racial integration to be possible for every relationship type considered, whereas the town respondents tended to be more equally divided in their evaluations.

4. Possibility - Desire for Integration:

   (a) Village people consistently demonstrated as a group a greater degree of incongruence between the evaluation of the possibility

for racial integration and the desire for it: a relatively high degree of possibility vs. a lower degree of desire.

(b) A much stronger and more consistent general positive association existed between perceived opportunity for and desire for racial integration relative to each of the different relationships examined for town residents than for village people.

DISCUSSION

Limits of Generalization and Major Conclusions

The primary significance of our results lie in the questions they raise, rather than in the firm conclusions that can be drawn from them. A note of marked caution is in order regarding attempts to generalize the findings we have reported above beyond the study population involved for two reasons: (1) the relatively small and homogeneous population studied -- black homemakers with children from one Texas County -- and; (2) the lack of any other prior empirical findings to use for direct comparisons. Future research is needed to determine whether or not the results we presented are generally valid for similar and different types of black populations.

Certainly, the extant literature would indicate that metropolitan blacks of all kinds (and in all geographical locations) should differ from the respondents studied here on their perceptions of race relations.[19/] But, important questions remain to be answered: what magnitude of difference exists and are there similarities? Also, even among rural populations of blacks, young people and adult men are likely to differ from adult females in their perceptions of and orientations toward race relations. But, how significantly and in what ways do they differ? Also, differences in the nature and quality of interracial relations among communities are

likely to lead to local variations. What is the range and distribution of variations in this regard? In addition, research is needed to explore additional facets of blacks' perception of race relations not considered here; for instance, "evaluative prejudice",[20] and actual perceived impact of different kinds of interracial interactions and contacts.

Whatever the limitations, our research findings on southern rural blacks' orientations toward prejudice and race provide the best possible empirical basis for generalizations that exists. Consequently, we assert that the conclusions drawn from our investigation are probably valid for similar populations across the South. This bold statement should serve as a provocation to researchers to challenge the general validity of the findings reported here through additional research. The most important general conclusions from our findings are as follows:

1. Blacks perceive a high degree of racial prejudice among their white counterparts.

2. Blacks tend to be relatively positive about the possibility for racial integration in general, but tend to be divided on the desirability of it.

3. Substantial differences in orientation toward race relations exist among blacks relative to size of place of residence (see "Summary of Findings" for particulars).

4. Many blacks still do not desire racial integration in schools, even though they perceive it to be possible and, in fact, it has taken place.

Relevance to Prior Research

The town-village differences observed here do indicate support for

the notion of extending Williams' generalization that large city residents, as compared to those in smaller cities, exhibit less prejudice of the affectual type to categorical size of place (town-village) differences at the lower end of the size of place continuum.[21] However, our findings indicate that just the converse pattern of difference exists between town and village relative to cognitive prejudice (stereotypes).[22] Do these converse patterns of differences extend upward on the size of place residence scale? At any rate, researchers should take note that different kinds of prejudice can be distributed differently among any given population and may vary differently in relation to any given variable (such as type of place of residence).

Noteworthy also is the finding that the greater perception of prejudice among town blacks is especially pronounced for situations involving direct contact between the races, versus stereotypes involving more remote contact held by whites (see Table 10, page 21). Perhaps this is a function of more opportunity for interracial contact in the town than the all-black villages.[23] Such an interpretation would appear to be congruent with prior results reported by Williams (1965) on the association of frequency of interaction and prejudice.

Any differences in perception of prejudice found in this study can not be directly linked to variables reported as significant in this regard from prior research results.[24] Whether differences in age as well as in these other variables within the study groups correlate with variations in perception of prejudice, is a question to be considered in future analysis. Also, whether or not possible variations existing between town

and village dwellers on factors not explored here (subjective class placement and social participation patterns, for instance) also needs to be looked at.

Theoretical Possibilities

It can be inferred from our findings that imposed racial integration within small communities in the South is likely to be considered undesirable by sizeable portions of the black populations involved. Why did sizeable proportions of the rural blacks studied appear to lack a desire for racial integration? We suggest a rationale for providing an answer to this question by posing several other questions, presuming integration occurs:

(1) Which racial group is most likely to lose a variety of formal leadership roles and opportunities to realize personal leadership in informal situations?

(2) Which one is likely to lose middle-class type occupational positions, as duplicative positions are eliminated?

(3) Which one is likely to most frequently suffer subjection as status subordinates in all kinds of interracial contacts?

(4) Which one is likely to have arguments, confrontations, and conflicts evolving from interracial contacts resolved in their favor?

(5) In the case of schools and other public systems, once the original racially-separate systems are merged, which racial group is likely to decide: which set of facilities are to be used for what (or used at all); which people will be retained in employment; and, of those who are retained, who will be assigned which roles, who will get raises and promotions?

It appears likely that there are important negative consequences for the fulfillment of life goals of many blacks that result from the process of integrating a previously segregated system, and that they realize this. Whatever the prospects this process has for long-run

good to the larger society, and the majority of blacks in it, many black individuals will suffer both short-run and long-run negative costs. We should not ignore this possibility. What proportion of the research that has been done by social scientists on potential or actual impact of integrating racially-segregated systems has focused on the negative latent consequences of this process, as compared with that focused on the intended positive results?[25/] Who gets hurt more than helped? To what extent are they hurt? Could latent negative consequences be avoided or meliorated: How? Shouldn't we -- if we are to be scientifically objective -- examine the possible negative consequences as closely as we do the intended or presumed positive ones? At any rate, the questions posed above should provide some basis for directing attention toward potentially fruitful and relevant areas of sociological inquiry.

Our findings on perception of opportunity for racial integration do not mesh well with the results of our direct observations and information from key informants. While the respondents generally had a positive orientation toward the possibility of racial integration over a variety of contexts, our objective evaluation indicates that little actual integration exists in these social contexts, except for schools and occupational relationships. Of course, simply because racial integration does not generally exist, doesn't mean that it is not possible. Another conclusion from our findings, that perception of opportunity is positively related to desire for integration, would appear to indicate that the difference noted between possibility and realization is not due to a lack of desire on the part of most blacks. At any rate, the need to explain this

incongruency points to another area of needed research.

In reference to place of residence differences, our results indicated that small town blacks, relative to those from villages, desired integration more often but perceived it to be possible less often. A possible explanation of this phenomenon lies in the concept of relative deprivation: perhaps the town blacks are more aware of existing inequalities in their own social structure, as opposed to gains in civil rights they might perceive as being made elsewhere. (One could investigate whether there is a difference in exposure to mass media between townspeople and villagers.) Supposing blacks in a small town are more sharply aware of the disparity between what could be and the reality of race relations in their own community, they could be expected to be more sensitive to prejudice.[26/]

The findings reported here provide plenty of fuel to ignite imagination of the theoretically inclined along other avenues of inquiry. For instance, in what ways do the findings presented here provide a basis for developing a theoretical rationale for explaining the tendency of blacks to migrate to metropolitan centers -- or to not migrate for that matter?[27/] In addition, considerable variation was observed in reference to all three race relation variables considered here, but particularly in reference to desire for racial integration. What factors of social structure and personality contribute to the variations noted in these phenomena? What significance do these variations in racial orientations have for subsequent behavior, social relations, and psychological states?

Sociological Priorities and Initiatives

Whatever else we may have accomplished or not accomplished in this

paper, the simple fact that this research has been done and reported as a contribution to an Experiment Station project provides evidence in support of Coleman's (1965:405) speculation that previously "cautious" administrators and officials "may welcome research in this field" or, at least, tolerate it. We hope that this report will provoke and stimulate rural sociologists and other social scientists in the South to test the general validity of this statement through research initiatives in rural race relations and related problems.

From our perspective, taking the explicit value-directed approach toward involvement in race relation problems and social action on the part of sociologists, in general, advocated in a very recent article by Norman (1971),[28/] would seem grossly premature in reference to rural blacks at this time, given our glaring lack of hard facts and viable theory on their circumstances and the potential alternative for improving these. It is our belief that the best possible basis for effective, rational action oriented toward deliberate change is a sound knowledge base. If all the sociologists are going to expend their energy and time crusading, who will build this knowledge base?

FOOTNOTES

1. It was our decision to follow Lee Coleman's (1965: 399) suggestions to give high priority to the need for descriptive information about the rural blacks in the South in our first report evolving from the data gathered on orientations toward race relations. Later reports of analyses of theoretical significance are intended (e.g., the significance of perceived racial prejudice for blacks' orientation toward rural out-migration).

2. A good indication of this research bias is evidenced in a recent book of essays edited by Parsons and Clark (1966), where one essay by Pettigrew is labeled "White Attitudes Toward the Negro", but the reversal of this relationship is not considered in any other essay. We had similar experiences as we investigated other books that are intended to be overviews of the Negro (Pettigrew, 1971; Broom and Glenn, 1967; Raab, 1962).

3. An inverse relationship has been generally noted to exist between SES and prejudice.

4. An inverse relationship has been noted to exist between formality of relationship and degree of prejudice,

5. The fact that our respondents are Southern, black females and predominantly lower-class, would indicate that they should be more highly prejudiced on the average than most other social groupings, according to the literature reviewed above.

6. The race relation instruments used here were piggy-backed onto a set of instruments on family structures, processes, and resources developed in collaboration with a number of other researchers participating in an interdisciplinary, interstate study (NC-90) which attempts to discover family-related factors involved in the inter-generational perpetuation of poverty. The Texas Agricultural Experiment Station accepted responsibility for the representation of a sample of southern, rural Negroes in the larger project. Other state Experiment Stations collaborating on this project are California, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

7. Originally, we had decided to select only one town of about 5,000 people that would be relatively representative of such places in the nonmetropolitan portion of East Texas. The size of place criteria were determined to permit comparability with similar population centers being studied by other states, and the geographical location was established by our desire to tap the traditional southern cultural type. We decided on the strategy of selecting only one "representative" town rather than a sample of such towns in order to facilitate building on to the survey through direct

observation of a wholistic social unit and through time lapse data within the limitations of a small budget. Once we had selected the town, the villages were observed in eyeballing the surrounding hinterland, and it was decided to include them as well in order to get some idea of intrarural place of residence variations. This could be done at little additional cost because we used the same interviewers in both the town and villages, and the villages were within easy traveling distance of the town. W. Kennedy Upham (TAES Demographer) assisted in selection of the town and in other ways to be noted later. The screening criteria for selection of respondents was imposed by agreement of the NC-90 Technical Committee.

8. We observed from our interactions with the black interviewers and others that there was considerable hostility among the blacks toward integration of the schools. However, although some "instances" had occurred, the transition appeared to be taking place (at least on the surface) without many overt acts of resistance from either side.

9. Direct observations of the study area were made by W. Kennedy Upham, William P. Kuvlesky, and Katheryn Thomas just prior to and during the survey. In addition, M. B. Flippen, a graduate student, recorded direct observations and information from key informants on the nature of race relations in the study area during June, 1971.

10. These key descriptors were selected with two considerations in mind: to provide a brief but meaningful picture of the objectively determined social circumstances of the respondents, and to ascertain possible type of residence differences in variables known to be associated generally with prejudice (age, SES indicators, education). No claim is made that all possible, useful characteristics were examined.

11. W. Kennedy Upham deserves much credit for his assistance in selection of the study units, supervising the mapping of the selected places, and developing the rapport with local officials and informants that aided us in bringing the study off without any unpleasant instances or apparent disruptions of the local social systems.

12. This is a modification of a scale reported by Works (1961), which he indicated had high face validity.

13. Store ownership was added to the DI scale after the other comparable relationship types were decided upon as a test of its utility. Although we did not originally plan to use it in calculating the total DI scale, it did differentiate well -- it was more useful than the school item in this regard -- so we decided to use it.

14. Katheryn Thomas deserves recognition for supervising all data operations related to this investigation and for her assistance in statistical computations. Nancy Dawson deserves recognition for her assistance in all phases of data processing.

15. Although our measures precluded the computation of valid Correlation Coefficients (due to unmet assumptions), these were calculated anyway on the association of total DI scores with total PPI scores for each residence type. Both "r"'s indicated a moderate association, but the village "r" was larger (+.05).

16. It should be noted that the school context was singled out here not because it is associated with a disproportionately high rate of lack of desire for integration, but because it represents the only situation whereby these blacks can be assured of whites granting them freedom to integrate.

17. See APPENDIX D. The converse relationship is strongly patterned for town but not for village.

18. Of the relationships we considered here, those judged to be more formal are: ownership of store, church, and school.

19. Since our study included only rural, Southern black females, we have no basis for testing the assertion that prejudice and/or perception of prejudice is highest within this particular group, as we could expect from the significant work done up to this point; however, we did find a very high degree of prejudice perceived and, in turn, reciprocated by our study populations. Comparable data from a sample of metropolitan black homemakers gathered this summer will make it possible to begin exploring this issue more directly.

20. As was noted earlier, Williams (1964:28) conceptually divides prejudice into three types -- cognitive, affectual, and evaluative. By evaluative, he refers to orientations toward normative standards pertaining to race relations and, particularly, orientations toward relevant public policy in this regard.

21. The affectual type of prejudice pertains to orientations toward actual interracial interactions and is indicated by some measure of preference for "social distance" (Williams, 1964:28). It is our opinion that our measure of blacks' preference for racial integration taps this conceptual element.

    There is, in fact, an important ecological factor involved here: the villages are relatively isolated from the town by at least 15 miles of forest and rangeland. Travel within the villages and between them and the town involves traveling dirt or gravel roads. Though neither group appeared to be overly eager (on the whole) to interact with whites (see Table 11), there was nonetheless a substantially greater desire for racial integration among the townspeople than among the villagers which might be due to more frequent contact with whites in town. However, if one were to order these social situations by degree of formality, it is apparent that the gap between the two populations is not as great at the informal

end of the scale. Thus, it can be seen that as the proposed situational context of interracial contact increases in intimacy, desire for integration decreases: all this is compatible with Williams' conclusions drawn from the Cornell studies.

22. Our reasoning here is that the blacks' perceptions of whites' negative stereotypes about them is itself a negative stereotype (however, valid) and can be viewed as a measure of negative, cognitive prejudice. Inferences from our results shed some light on the relationship existing between two types of racial prejudice (cognitive and affectual) mentioned by Robin Williams (1964:28) among blacks. Blacks' indications of desire or lack of desire to interact with whites can be viewed as an indicator of affectual prejudice (usually indicated by preference for social distance). The fact that most of both our town and village respondents indicate a high degree of cognitive prejudice but tended to be split into camps (+ and -) on affectual prejudice, indicates that these two types of prejudice need not be highly correlated. The need to develop and explore hypotheses aimed at explaining such differences points to a relevant area for future research.

23. Refer to Footnote 21 for an elaboration of this point.

24. When we compared the two residential groupings on such dependent variables as were found to be relevant in the literature, we found that socioeconomic status -- as measured by the objective indicators of education, occupation and income -- varies little by town versus village residency. Neither is there a significant difference in family size between the two populations, though there is somewhat of an age variation according to respondents' place of residence.

25. We don't know the answer to this question; however, it does point to an interesting line of inquiry for those interested in the sociology of sociology. It certainly would be of interest to us to find out just how much rigorous research has been done on the actual positive consequences imposed integration produces for various social types of blacks.

26. Mutual participation of blacks and whites in various social contexts is viewed as possible by a much smaller proportion of the town respondents. Perhaps, this is partially influenced by the fact that they experience more negative interracial contact than do the villagers. Whether the anti-black prejudice exhibited by whites in the town is indeed stronger than that displayed in outlying rural areas, or whether there is simply more likelihood of blacks encountering it there is a question worthy of research.

27. Margaret Cannon is in the process of structuring an analysis of our data aimed at exploring the relationships between perceived prejudice, evaluations of similarity of prejudice not just in metropolitan centers but in areas which vary geographically as well as by rural-urban composition.

28. Charles M. Norman, "The Role of Sociologists in Race Relations", Phylon, 32-2 (Summer, 1971), pp. 193-197. Those readers inclined toward the activist orientation of the "new sociology" will enjoy Norman's perspective -- but not the results of a survey he did of race experts in sociology about their orientations toward involvement in this problem.

REFERENCES

BETTELHEIM, B. and M. JANOWITZ (1964) Social Change and Prejudice. Toronto, Ontario: Collier-MacMillan Canada, Ltd.

BROOM, L. and N. D. GLENN (1967) Transformation of the Negro American. New York: Harper and Row.

COLEMAN, A. L. (1965) "The rural-urban variable in race relations." Rural Sociology 30 (December):393-406.

COTHRAN, T. C. (1951) "Negro conceptions of white people." American Journal of Sociology 56 (March): 458-467.

COX, J. A. and J. D. KRUMBOLTZ (1958) "Racial bias in peer ratings of basic airmen." Sociometry 21 (December): 292-299.

GLENN, N. D. and C. M. BONJEAN (1969) Blacks in the United States. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

KUTNER, N. G. (1971) "Who is the 'head of the family'?: some evidence from lower-class Negro couples." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Sociological Society, Miami.

KUVLESKY, W. P. and D. E. WRIGHT (1970) Poverty in Texas: The Distribution of Low-Income Families. College Station: Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, DIR 65-4.

LEVER, M. F. and W. K. UPHAM (1968) Poverty Among Non-White Families in Texas and the Nation: A Comparative Analysis. College Station: Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, DIR 4.

MANN, J. H. (1958) "The influence of racial prejudice on sociometric choices and perceptions." Sociometry 21 (June): 150-158.

MILLER, E. W. (1966) The Negro in America: A Bibliography. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

NOEL, D. L. and A. PINKNEY (1964) "Correlates of prejudice: some racial differences and similarities." American Journal of Sociology 69 (May): 609-622.

NORMAN, C. M. (1971) "The role of sociologists in race relations." Phylon 32 (Summer): 193-197.

PARSONS, T. and K. B. CLARK (eds.) (1966) The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

PETTIGREW, T. F. (1971) Racially Separate or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

RAAB, E. (ed.) (1962) American Race Relations Today: Studies of the Problems Beyond Desegregation. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

UPHAM, W. K. (1971) "Shelby County: table 1. basic population characteristics." College Station: Texas A&M University, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology. (Memorandum to NC-90 work group).

U. S. Bureau of the Census (1963) U. S. Census of the Population 1, Part 45: 1960 Texas. "Characteristics of the population." Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

U. S. Bureau of the Census (1971) 1970 Census of the Population PC(V2) 45: Texas. "Advance report of general population characteristics." Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce Publication.

WESTIE, F. R. and D. H. HOWARD (1954) "Social status differentials and the race attitudes of Negroes." American Sociological Review 19 (October): 584-591.

WILLIAMS, R. M., JR. (1964) Strangers Next Door: Ethnic Relations in American Communities. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

WORKS, E. (1961) "The prejudice-interaction hypothesis from the point of view of the Negro minority group." American Journal of Sociology 67 (July): 47-52.

APPENDIX A: RACE RELATIONS

INSTRUMENTS

1. Perception of Prejudice Directed Toward Negroes by Whites.

Please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements: (Indicate the four alternatives to the respondent before reading the statements. Circle one number for each. FORCE A RESPONSE.)

(a) "White people around here judge Negroes by the worse type of Negroes."

4	3	2	1	(A-20)
Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

(b) "White people around here don't like to be around Negroes."

4	3	2	1	(A-21)
Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

(c) "White people around here don't like white kids to play with Negro kids."

4	3	2	1	(A-22)
Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

(d) "White people around here never let you forget they are white and you are Negro."

4	3	2	1	(A-23)
Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

(e) "White people around here think they are cleaner than Negroes."

4	3	2	1	(A-24)
Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	

(A-25,26)

2. Desire for Racial Integration:

If it were possible, would you prefer: (Read this statement prior to each item.)	Negroes Only	OR	Negroes and Whites	
	(Read this after each item.)			
(a) To go to church with	1		2	(A-30)
(b) To have my children attend school with	1		2	(A-31)
(c) Outside of school, to have my children play with	1		2	(A-32)
(d) To live in a neighborhood with	1		2	(A-33)
(e) To have close, personal friendships with	1		2	(A-34)
(f) To buy from stores owned by	1		2	(A-35)
				[ ] (A-36,37)

3. Perception of Possibility of Racial Integration:

Which of the things mentioned below do you think are really possible now where you live?

	P	NP	
(a) For Negroes and whites to attend church services together	1	2	(A-40)
(b) For Negro and white children to attend the same school	1	2	(A-41)
(c) For Negro and white children to play together outside of school	1	2	(A-42)
(d) For Negroes and whites to live close together in the same neighborhood	1	2	(A-43)
(e) For Negroes and whites to have close, personal friendships	1	2	(A-44)
			[ ] (A-45,46)

APPENDIX B

Part I: Distribution of Responses To "Perceived Prejudice" Items

Table 1. Item 1a: Responses to "White people around here judge Negroes by the worst type of Negro."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
1. Strongly Disagree	8	3	4
2. Tend to Disagree	20	10	12
3. Tend to Agree	31	39	37
4. Strongly Agree	41	48	47
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 6.42$	df = 3	$.05 < P < .10$	

Table 2. Item 1b: Responses to "White people around here don't like to be around Negroes."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=254)
	----------Percent----------		
1. Strongly Disagree	8	1	2
2. Tend to Disagree	22	16	17
3. Tend to Agree	41	41	41
4. Strongly Agree	29	42	40
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 10.53$	df = 3	$.01 < P < .02$	

Table 3. Item 1c: Responses to "White people around here don't like white kids to play with Negro kids."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=254)
	----------Percent----------		
1. Strongly Disagree	6	1	2
2. Tend to Disagree	28	15	17
3. Tend to Agree	35	39	38
4. Strongly Agree	31	45	43
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 8.51$	df = 2	$.01 < P < .02$	

"Strongly Disagree and Tend to Disagree" are grouped together for chi-square calculations.

APPENDIX B

Part I: Distribution of Responses To "Perceived Prejudice" Items

Table 1. Item 1a: Responses to "White people around here judge Negroes by the worst type of Negro."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=255)
	Percent		
1. Strongly Disagree	8	3	4
2. Tend to Disagree	20	10	12
3. Tend to Agree	31	39	37
4. Strongly Agree	41	48	47
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 6.42$	df = 3	$.05 < P < .10$	

Table 2. Item 1b: Responses to "White people around here don't like to be around Negroes."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=254)
	Percent		
1. Strongly Disagree	8	1	2
2. Tend to Disagree	22	16	17
3. Tend to Agree	41	41	41
4. Strongly Agree	29	42	40
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 10.53$	df = 3	$.01 < P < .02$	

Table 3. Item 1c: Responses to "White people around here don't like white kids to play with Negro kids."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=254)
	Percent		
1. Strongly Disagree	6	1	2
2. Tend to Disagree	28	15	17
3. Tend to Agree	35	39	38
4. Strongly Agree	31	45	43
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 8.51$	df = 2	$.01 < P < .02$	

"Strongly Disagree and Tend to Disagree" are grouped together for chi-square calculations.

Table 4. Item 1d: Responses to "White people around here never let you forget they are white and you are Negro."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=254)
	----------Percent----------		
1. Strongly Disagree	6	0	2
2. Tend to Disagree	14	8	9
3. Tend to Agree	33	29	30
4. Strongly Agree	47	63	59
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 6.21$ df = 2 $.02 < P < .05$

"Strongly Disagree" and "Tend to Disagree" are grouped together for chi-square calculations.

Table 5. Item 1e: Responses to "White people around here think they are cleaner than Negroes."

	Villages (N=51)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
1. Strongly Disagree	6	0	2
2. Tend to Disagree	12	7	8
3. Tend to Agree	31	27	27
4. Strongly Agree	51	66	63
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 5.75$ df = 2 $.05 < P < .10$

"Strongly Disagree" and "Tend to Disagree" are grouped together for chi-square calculations.

Part II: Distribution of Responses to "Desire For Integration" Items

Table 6. Item 2a: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to go to church with..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	63	48	51
Negroes and Whites	37	52	49
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 3.82$ df = 1 $.02 < P < .05$

Table 7. Item 2b: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to have your children attend school with..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	44	30	33
Negroes and Whites	56	70	67
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 3.86$ df = 1 $.02 < P < .05$

Table 8. Item 2c: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to have your children play, outside of school, with..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	46	36	38
Negroes and Whites	54	64	62
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 1:71$ df = 1 $.10 < P < .20$

Table 9. Item 2d: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to live in a neighborhood with..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	56	51	52
Negroes and Whites	44	49	48
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = .42$ df = 1 $.50 < P < .70$

Table 10. Item 2e: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to have close, personal friendships with..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	60	47	49
Negroes and Whites	40	53	51
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 2.82$	df = 1	$.05 < P < .10$	

Table 11. Item 2f: Responses to: "If it were possible, would you prefer to buy from stores owned by..."

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Negroes only	52	22	28
Negroes and Whites	48	78	72
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 19.05$	df = 1	$.001 < P < .01$	

Part II. Distribution of Responses to "Perception of Possibility of Integration" Items.

Table 12. Item 3a: Responses to: "Is it really possible now where you live for Negroes and whites to attend church services together?"

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Possible	65	55	57
Not possible	35	45	43
TOTAL	100	100	100
$x^2 = 1.69$	df = 1	$.10 < P < .20$	

Table 13. Item 3b: Responses to: "Is it really possible now where you live for Negro and white children to attend the same school?"

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=204)	Total (N=256)
	----------Percent----------		
Possible	100	96	97
Not possible	0	4	3
TOTAL	100	100	100

Insufficient expected cell frequencies for chi-square calculations.

Table 14. Item 3c: Responses to: "Is it really possible now where you live for Negro and white children to play together outside of school?"

	Villages (N=52	Town (N=203)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
Possible	88	74	77
Not possible	12	26	23
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 4.94$ df = 1 $.02 < P < .05$

Table 15. Item 3d: Responses to: "Is it really possible now where you live for Negroes and whites to live close together in the same neighborhood?"

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=203)	Total (255)
	----------Percent----------		
Possible	88	58	64
Not possible	12	42	36
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 17.06$ df = 1 $.001 < P < .01$

Table 16. Item 3e: Responses to: "Is it really possible now where you live for Negroes and whites to have close, personal friendships?"

	Villages (N=52)	Town (N=203)	Total (N=255)
	----------Percent----------		
Possible	67	57	59
Not possible	33	43	41
TOTAL	100	100	100

$x^2 = 1.77$ df = 1 $.10 < P < .20$

APPENDIX C

Description of the Study County

A significant correlate of the cultural type of the "Old South" is a negative attitude toward the process of school integration. The study county has clearly exhibited this attitude: One of the major independent school districts in the area was among the 46 in Texas which was still not racially integrated at the end of the 1969-70 school year. Only when threatened by a federal law suit (which it was almost certain to lose) did this district finally desegregate.

The study county is economically dependent upon cattle, broilers, and lumber. It is heavily rural, with only one urban place (i.e., community of 2,500 or more in population) and one other town of slightly more than 1,000 people. Though the percentage of rural residents has declined slightly in the last decade, still about 75% of the population lives in rural areas (Upham, 1971). Twenty-two percent of the total employed males are in farming, (1960 Census, Vol. 1 - 45:535), and 58% of the families have an income of less than $3,000 per year (Kuvlesky and Wright, 1970:31): these figures are slightly higher than would be typical in most counties of East Texas.

The proportion of blacks in the study county is 25% of the population (1970 Census of the Population, Advance Report on Texas General Population Characteristics:41). As one would expect in this area, there are significant differences in standard of living between the black and white populations. An overwhelming 79% of the nonwhite population in the study county lives in poverty (i.e., annual income less than $3,000 yearly) (1960 Census, Vol. 1 - 45:599). The occupational profile of the nonwhite population is similar to that for Texas in general: blacks are sparsely represented in the higher prestige job categories, while there are disporportionate numbers of black service and private household workers and black laborers, especially farm (Lever and Upham, 1968:106-107). Likewise, the blacks in the study county have substantially fewer years of schooling: almost 62% received less than eight years of schooling, compared to 43% of the total Shelby population (1960 Census, Vol. 1 - 45:513 and 590).

APPENDIX D

Tables on Cross-Classification for Perception of Possibility for Integration (PPI) and Desire for Integration (DI) for Each Residence Type by Social Context.

Table 1. Racial Integration in Church: Possibility by Desire for Each Residence Type.

Desire	Town[1]		Villages[2]	
	Possible (N=115)	Not Possible (N=91)	Possible (N=34)	Not Possible (N=18)
	percent			
Negroes Only	37	62	53	83
N and W	63	38	47	17
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

[1] $X^2 = 11.866$ df = 1 $P < .001$

[2] $X^2 = 4.688$ df = 1 $.02 < P < .05$

Table 2. Racial Integration of Children in School: Possibility by Desire for Each Residence Type.

Desire	Town[1]		Villages	
	Possible (N=198)	Not Possible (N=9)	Possible (N=52)	Not Possible (N=0)
	percent			
Negroes Only	30	22	44	--
N and W	70	78	56	--
TOTAL	100	100	100	--

[1] $X^2 = .268$ df = 1 $.50 < P < .70$

Table 3. Racial Integration in Neighborhoods: Possibility by Desire for Each Residence Type.

Desire	Town[1]		Villages[2]	
	Possible (N=118)	Not Possible (N=88)	Possible (N=46)	Not Possible (N=6)
	percent			
Negroes Only	42	64	57	50
N and W	58	36	43	50
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

[1] $X^2 = 9.861$ df = 1 $.001 < P < .01$

[2] Chi-Square not possible due to low frequencies.

Table 4. Racial Integration Among Children at Play: Possibility by Desire for Each Residence Type.

Desire	Town[1]		Villages[2]	
	Possible (N=151)	Not Possible (N=55)	Possible (N=46)	Not Possible (N=6)
	percent			
Negroes Only	28	60	44	67
N and W	72	40	56	33
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

[1] $X^2 = 18.038$ df = 1 $P < .001$

[2] Chi-Square not possible due to low frequencies.

Table 5. Racial Integration of Close Friends: Possibility by Desire for Each Residence Type.

Desire	Town[1]		Villages[2]	
	Possible (N=116)	Not Possible (N=90)	Possible (N=35)	Not Possible (N=17)
	percent			
Negroes Only	34	64	54	71
N and W	66	36	46	29
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

[1] $X^2 = 19.326$ df = 1 $P < .001$

[2] $X^2 = 1.263$ df = 1 $.20 < P < .30$